UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,390	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030238US1	7557

46797   7590   11/02/2006

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
HARPER, LEON JONATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/600,390	CHATTERJEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon J. Harper	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 March 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-9,11-19,21-27 and 29-35_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-9,11-19,21-27 and 29-35_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 March 2006_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6/20/03_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed 8/22/2006 has been entered.   Only claims 9, 11-18 and 25

remain pending in this application, all other claims have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
        obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9,11-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US 20040205545 (hereinafter Bar) in view of US 6519603

(hereinafter Bays) and in further view of US 5537526 (hereinafter Anderson), and in

further view of US5253362 (Nolan).

As for claim 9 Bar discloses: one or more applications for manipulating data (See paragraph 0021); an annotation store for storing annotations created for data manipulated by the one or more applications (See paragraph 0025 lines 9-10) an annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing annotations for data manipulated by the one or more (See paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of an annotation browser is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly disclose an annotation browser (See column 7 lines 9-12). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Bays into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser to scan or flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

The combination of Bar and Bays while not differing substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked. Anderson however does disclose an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects(See column 5 lines 6-11); and wherein selecting the links to the associated data

objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be

invoked (See column 4 lines 36-40), while Nolan discloses storing annotations (See

column 5 lines 16-20: note the annotation must me stored). It would have been obvious

to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of

Anderson and Nolan into the system of Bar and Bay. The modification would have been

obvious because when users share data it is often desirable to be able to find related or

associated annotated documents and being able to link to documents is the best way to

show through annotations that two documents are related to give other users a better

idea of how the annotation relates to the document (See Bays column 1 lines 17-20).

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display data and indications

of what displayed data has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 7 lines

32-35 note that the data is being displayed as well and the indicators are attached to the

bar).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Anderson

discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more

annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See Anderson column 4 lines

64-66). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to

have incorporated the teaching of Anderson into the system of Bar and Bay. The

modification would have been obvious because when users share data it is often

desirable to be able to find related or associated annotated documents and being able

to link to documents is the best way to show through annotations that two documents

are related to give other users a better idea of how the annotation relates to the

document (See Bays column 1 lines 17-20).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data

object (See figure 6 and column 5 lines 51-55), and the annotation browser is

configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by

the common annotation (See column 5 lines 60-65 notes the nurses notes hold

annotations).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation

icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See figure 5 and

note that you are going to get a different view depending on what the annotation is).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon

to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon

to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 5 line60-

column 6 line 4 and noting that icon is in a cell and will display differently depending on the annotation) .

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See Figure 5 "showing details").

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Nolan disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See figure 6 "expanded annotations")..

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See figure 6 and note that annotations are contained within the local data storage).

As for claim 25 Bar discloses: an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data sources associated with the annotations (See paragraph

0025); a set of annotatable data objects points defining portions of data sources

associated with the annotations described by the associated annotations (See

paragraph 0026 anchor=point). A set of structures, each defining a set of annotation

fields (See paragraph 0028) a set of plug-in component, each for interfacing between

one or more applications and an annotation server (See paragraph 0163); an annotation

server configured to receive, via the plug-in components, request to access annotations

for one or more of the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more

applications running on the silent computer and generated a graphical user interface

screen , based on the annotation structure associated with the one or more of the

annotabtable data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for one or more

annotatable data object points (See paragraph 00163 for sever configuration and See

paragraph 0025); and a browser is configured to access annotations in the annotation

store independently of the applications in which the annotations were created (See

paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure

of a web based browser and providing links to annotated data objects wherein selecting

the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the

associated data objects to be invoked is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does

explicitly disclose a web based browser (See column 7 lines 9-12) while Anderson

discloses providing links to annotated data objects wherein selecting the links to the

associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data

objects to be invoked (See column 4 lines 36-40). It would have been obvious to an

artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Bays and

Anderson into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if

users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser

to scan or flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for

content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/22/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues:

The references fail to teach at least an annotation browser configured to display

annotations and links to associated annotated data objects wherein selecting the links

to the associated data objects causes an applicant used to manipulate the associated

data objects to be invoked as claimed in independent claims 9 and 25. The system

disclosed in Anderson may use links to associate an annotation with parts of a

document to which an annotation refers. These links are not displayed to a user,

however , as recited in claims 9 and 25.

Examiner responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Interpretation of Claims- Broadest Reasonable Interpretation during patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case there is not explicit requirement that the links be displayed to a user.

Conclusion
THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-

0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH
Leon J. Harper
October 27, 2006

MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER